

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application with claim 19 canceled in response to a restriction requirement. Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 2-8 and 11-17. With entry of this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 2 and 10. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended claim 2 by placing claim 2 in independent form. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 and its dependent claims 3-9 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner objected to claim 10 for reciting "plurality of electron beam" Applicants have amended claim 10 accordingly and respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 9 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa (US 5965308) in view of Muraki et al. (US 5929454). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

An embodiment of the present invention forms parts of a pattern on a wafer with a first exposure apparatus using light and a second exposure apparatus using electron beams. For example, the first exposure apparatus is used for forming a part of the pattern that requires lower precision, while the second exposure apparatus is used for forming the other part of the pattern requiring higher precision. In this manner, the second exposure apparatus does not need to store information for the entire pattern.

In contrast, neither Ozawa nor Muraki disclose forming parts of a pattern with two such exposures apparatuses. Ozawa merely discloses an exposure apparatus with an excimer laser light. Ozawa does not disclose the use of electron beam apparatus in combination with an excimer laser light for forming a pattern. Muraki teaches an exposure apparatus with electron beams. Muraki does not disclose the use of light exposure apparatus in combination with the electron beam exposure apparatus. Thus, none of the references teaches a combination of one apparatus with light and another apparatus with electron beams for forming a pattern on a wafer.

Indeed, the references teach away against any such combination by focusing exclusively on either a light exposure apparatus or an electron beam apparatus. The Examiner's rejection is thus based on impermissible hindsight. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and its dependent claim 9 are not anticipated by or obvious in view of the reference either alone or in combination.

The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Muraki. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The preamble of claim 10 recites an electron beam exposure apparatus for exposing a wafer "in combination with an optical stepper." The claim further recites that the exposure unit of the electron beam exposure apparatus has a plurality of electron beams having an interval of substantially N times or $1/N$ times, where N is a natural number, of a predetermined interval of "said optical stepper for moving said wafer." Thus, the body of the claim indicates that the electron beam exposure apparatus is used with an optical stepper. In contrast, Muraki is merely directed to an exposure apparatus with electron beams. The section cited by the Examiner at Col. 3, lines 35-57 does not disclose an apparatus used with "an optical stepper." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is not anticipated by Muraki. Nor would claim 10 be obvious in view of Muraki and Ozawa for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 and its dependent claims 11-18 are in condition for allowance.

Indeed, in view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If, for any reason, the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 892-8630 to discuss any steps necessary to place the application in condition for allowance.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. 514802001100.

Dated: January 20, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By

Mehran Arjomand

Registration No.: 48,231

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

555 West Fifth Street, Suite 3500

Los Angeles, California 90013

(213) 892-5630

RECEIVED
FEB - 2 2004
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800